

ATTACHMENT A

PG&E's Integrated Resource Plan
Summary of Long-Term Plan

PG&E Integrated Resource Plan Summary of Long Term Plan

I. Introduction

PG&E seeks approval of its demand forecast for the period 2005 through 2014 and its resource procurement strategy to meet the defined resource needs. Additionally, PG&E seeks that the Commission grant it authority to execute contracts for resource procurement with term duration of 5 years or less, and approve expenditures for proposed Energy Efficiency programs through 2008. This procurement can only occur if PG&E has reasonable assurances for full and timely cost recovery of procurement under this plan, provided for by a Commission extension of the AB57 trigger mechanism (codified as Section 454.5 of the Public Utilities Code).

PG&E advises the Commission that as part of its resource plan it is currently undertaking a competitive solicitation for renewable resources pursuant to R.04-04-026, and has initiated the process for two competitive procurement solicitations to meet its minimum defined long-term requirements. PG&E anticipates that long-term contracts resulting from these procurement solicitations will be submitted to the Commission for contract approval and rate recovery through compliance filings.

The plan is the culmination of the process defined by the Commission and used assumptions outlined by the Commission in its June 4, 2004 Assigned Commissioner's Rulings (ACR) and June 16 and June 29, 2004 Administrative Law Judge's Rulings. The result of this process is the identified need for additional energy and capacity resources throughout the forecast horizon, along with the strategy to meet these resource requirements.

PG&E's plan will allow it to procure capacity and energy products to meet the identified requirements, and is wholly consistent with the State's Energy Action Plan "loading order" for additional resources. The plan includes aggressive implementation of energy efficiency and demand response programs, shows how renewable resources can meet the Renewable Portfolio Standard target of 20% by 2010 under the Medium Load Case, and clean and efficient conventional generation to meet remaining load requirements. PG&E proposes to procure resources primarily through competitive solicitation in order to stimulate the power market in California and ensure the lowest cost procurement is achieved.

II. Resource Planning Methodology and Assumptions

PG&E employed a comprehensive and dynamic process in developing its preferred resource portfolio using current and appropriate assumptions, much of which came from publicly-available CEC data. PG&E considered a range of portfolio resource options in order to develop cost-effective and reasonable resource plans and ensure the preferred portfolio met the requirements of a range of scenarios required in the Commission's June 4, 2004 ACR.

In developing the portfolios discussed below, PG&E used several criteria to test candidate portfolios to ensure they met requirements and were sufficiently adaptable to be workable under

a range of potential conditions, including the ability to accommodate a range of market structure outcomes, customer demand, regulatory changes such as acceleration of resource adequacy targets, and gas price volatility. PG&E also estimated the carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions of the preferred portfolio to assess future risk when CO₂ becomes regulated.

a. Planning Methodology

PG&E developed three resource portfolios, corresponding to the three load forecasts defined by the commission in the June 4, 2004 ACR. All portfolios were designed to meet several criteria, including meeting and maintaining resource adequacy requirements through the planning horizon, achieving mandated renewable resource procurement targets, minimizing the risk of stranded costs in the future, increasing resource diversity to reduce fuel risks. Portfolios were also analyzed for their environmental attributes and carbon emissions.

The "Preferred" portfolio was then measured against several additional metrics to ensure it was sufficiently flexible to respond to changes in the economic and operating environment. These metrics include estimated impact on ratepayer costs, and analysis of financial feasibility. Finally, the medium load scenario "preferred" portfolio was analyzed for price risk using a Monte Carlo simulation of electricity and gas prices.

PG&E assessed the financial feasibility of meeting the resource commitments using either 50% utility ownership or 100% contracts for new, conventional generation resources. The assessment compared projections of key credit ratios with benchmark ranges necessary to maintain or strengthen PG&E's current low investment grade credit ratings. The analysis concluded that all scenarios appear to be financially feasible, but the 100% contracting scenarios, particularly with high load growth, would make it difficult if not impossible for PG&E to improve its credit ratings.

Portfolios were constructed in a "bottoms-up" manner consistent with the EAP loading order. Beginning with the forecast of capacity and energy requirements for expected bundled customers (i.e., net of existing direct access (DA) and projected Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) and noncore load), losses for transmission and distribution and unaccounted for energy (UFE) were added to derive expected capacity and energy requirements. Funded energy efficiency (EE) programs and existing interruptible programs reduced these requirements. Existing resources including Utility-Retained Generation, Qualifying Facility (QF) contracts, California Department of Water Resources (DWR)-assigned resources, and other existing contracts were subtracted from the load to identify the Net Open Position (NOP).

The NOP was filled using the preferred resources identified in the EAP. PG&E first added reliable, cost-effective and attainable EE programs. Distributed generation was then added based on PG&E and California Energy Commission (CEC) forecasts. Next, state mandated programs were added to the portfolio, including Demand Response (DR) and renewable resources. Decision 03-06-032 requires that price-induced DR provide 5 percent of capacity requirements at time of system peak by 2007 and going forward through the planning horizon. A variety of renewable resources were then added to the portfolio to meet the RPS annual procurement target (APT) of an additional 1 percent of energy requirements met by these resources each year.

Finally, PG&E added conventional thermal resources to balance out the remainder of its capacity and energy requirements. Conventional thermal resources included contracts with existing resources and new and efficient dispatchable and peaking resources, which are both contracted and utility owned. PG&E's preferred resource plan assumes all new resources will be deliverable to load. As described in the Plan Implementation section (Section IV), PG&E intends to procure resources primarily through competitive solicitations, although certain resource opportunities of substantial benefit to its customers may materialize in other ways as well (for example, settlement of litigation).

PG&E's resource planning process incorporates transmission in an iterative process. This IRP assumed all existing and new transmission contained in its most recent CAISO-approved 2003 Electric Transmission Grid Expansion Plan., which includes all network reinforcements necessary to meet expected load and is expected to minimize CAISO Reliability Must Run (RMR) requirements in PG&E's service territory. The 2005 PG&E Electric Transmission Grid Expansion Plan will incorporate the procurement under this resource plan. This is consistent with I.00-11-001 in that the transmission plan is developed based on resources that have been identified.

b. Planning Assumptions

In developing the resource plan, PG&E developed and used assumptions appropriate for long term plan development. While there are many assumptions required in developing a long term plan, several driving assumptions are load forecast development, electricity and gas prices, QF contract resources, supply options, and transmission. These are discussed below.

i. **Load Forecast:** Consistent with the June 4 ACR, PG&E developed three hourly load forecasts to represent a realistic range of likely future operating requirements that the utility should reasonably plan for. The forecasts reflecting different levels of growth and bundled load departures used for portfolio development. PG&E provided an additional 16 forecasts as requested by the Commission in the June 4 ACR and clarified in the June 16 ALJ's Ruling.

PG&E's medium-load scenario energy and demand forecast is based on actual system load, escalated using internal forecasts for 2005 and 2006 and CEC IEPR projected growth rates thereafter and adjusted to account for possible CCA and noncore load departures. PG&E's adjustment for CCA and non-core load departures did not identify specific loads that may leave bundled service, rather assumed a portion of total load would leave. This method allows PG&E to plan appropriately. The high-load scenario assumes more optimistic load growth with less bundled customer departures. Conversely, the low-load scenario includes pessimistic assumptions regarding economic growth and assumes a higher level of bundled customer departures.

A significant uncertainty in the load forecasts is the potential migration of load from bundled service through Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) programs and due to a core/noncore market structure, both which are likely to occur during the planning horizon. PG&E believes it has made reasonable assumptions regarding these issues given the information available today,

however, it cannot know what the legislature and the Commission will ultimately decide, nor the quantity of currently bundled load that may elect to participate in these programs.

ii. **Electricity and Gas Prices:** PG&E developed forecasts for electricity and gas prices based on the forward trading markets. These prices were based on April 19, 2004 forward market quotes, and are consistent with the prices PG&E used in other concurrent proceedings. PG&E uses the forward prices since they represent current market-based, opportunity costs, rather than estimates derived from conjectures about supply and demand conditions in the future.

iii. **QF Resources:** The June 4 ACR required the utilities to show current quantities of baseload QF purchases and plans for continuing to meet those needs. PG&E assumed that existing QFs under contract with PG&E would continue delivering capacity and energy consistent with historical deliveries. PG&E made no assumptions regarding the future of specific QF's with expiring contracts, rather it assumed that, in aggregate, 90% of all expiring QF energy and capacity would remain in operation and sell energy to PG&E for the plan term. PG&E assumed the remaining 10% would either sell to alternate suppliers or shut down after contract expiration.

PG&E proposes that QFs with expiring contracts could either participate in its procurement solicitations for multi-year contracts or could elect to continue selling capacity and energy to PG&E under an annual contract based on market prices. These contract options provide QF generators with expiring contracts an opportunity to continue selling to PG&E and comply with all PURPA requirements. PG&E made no assumption in its resource planning regarding the choices that individual QFs may make in the future.

iv. **Supply Resources Options:** PG&E developed a portfolio of potential resources available to meet its future requirements, including existing and new renewable and conventional generating resources. For existing resources PG&E developed assumptions on resource availability, cost, and characteristics based on its knowledge of current non-contracted resources in the market. For new conventional and renewable resource information it relied primarily on information published by the CEC as part of its Integrated Energy Policy Report.

III. Resource Plan

The medium-load scenario portfolio represents PG&E's best estimate of how it plans to meet the needs it expects and serves as PG&E's proposed resource plan. The low-load and high load case scenarios represent a bandwidth of potential outcomes depending on changes in assumptions, and PG&E developed portfolios for these scenarios as derivations of the medium load portfolio. PG&E used derivations of the medium load portfolio rather than develop new portfolios "whole-cloth" to ensure that the medium load portfolio was sufficiently robust and flexible to respond to changes in demand over time within the range of the three load scenarios.

Mindful of the significant uncertainties in the evolution of the market structure and the extent and timing of retail load departures to community aggregation and noncore service, PG&E proposes a plan that can be adjusted to respond to changing conditions within the range of three

load scenarios yet, importantly, makes long-term commitments that can result in the development of the necessary new, cleaner and more efficient resources and which also meets minimum reliability needs. PG&E's plan vigorously fills our net open position to the maximum feasible extent with environmentally preferred resources, such as customer energy efficiency, demand response, and renewables.

a. IRP Medium Load Scenario Portfolio ("Preferred Portfolio")

PG&E's medium load scenario portfolio includes a host of resources that meets the resource adequacy target of 15-17% of peak demand, supports the State's Energy Action Plan loading order of resources, and contains a flexible mix of resources to meet customer demand and energy requirements. Under the plan PG&E will procure capacity and energy from energy efficiency programs, renewable resources and conventional generation, which may be either utility owned or contracted.

i. Energy Efficiency

PG&E's preferred portfolio includes all cost-effective and reliable energy efficiency programs, consistent with the EAP. The energy efficiency programs included in the plan provide for an aggressive ramp-up of multi-faceted programs in the residential, commercial and industrial markets, with total potential expenditures of approximately \$1 billion over the 10-year planning horizon. As PG&E's net open needs are for peaking power in the near-term, initially new energy efficiency activities will focus on air and space cooling and lighting equipment. PG&E will aggressively target cost-effective energy savings during peak, off-peak and shoulder periods starting in 2007. PG&E proposed energy savings targets in its Prepared Testimony. The Commission adopted energy savings targets in the *Interim Opinion: Energy Savings Goals for Program Year 2006 and Beyond*, issued on September 29, 2004. The Commission's adopted targets are higher than PG&E's proposed targets. PG&E will prepare and file energy efficiency program plans for 2006 – 2008 that reflect the Commission's adopted targets.

ii. Other Demand Side Resources

PG&E expects a portion of its resource needs will be met by other demand side resources including price-induced demand response programs. These programs are assumed to meet 5% of PG&E's peak demand by 2007. The plan also anticipates distributed generation will further reduce resource needs.

iii. Renewable Resources

The preferred portfolio also includes sufficient renewable resources to meet RPS requirements. PG&E has proposed renewable resources based on their likely availability and value to the system, though actual procurement of renewable resources generation will occur based on "least-cost/best-fit" analysis of bids received through its proposed Renewable Procurement Plan and accompanying RFO for Renewable Resources, submitted to the CPUC on June 24, 2004 (R.04-04-026). Under the load assumptions of the Medium Load scenario, meeting the required 1 percent per year APT results in PG&E achieving the 20 percent RPS target in 2011. PG&E

performed a sensitivity analysis to evaluate achieving the 20 percent target in 2010. The additional wind resources added in the 2010 sensitivity are based on an assumption of QF contract restructurings to provide for repowering of a number of wind farms in the Altamont pass to upgrade to more efficient plants. This assumption is more easily evaluated than an assumption of a generic response to RPS solicitations. PG&E recently received approval of the contract for the repowering of the Buena Vista wind farm. Based on this initial outcome, PG&E assumes repowering of up to 400 MW of the almost 600 MW in the Altamont Wind Resource Area. There are several factors that can make wind repowerings favorable to ratepayers: the production is close to the load center, usually no additional transmission investment is needed, a higher gas-based SRAC price could be replaced by a lower fixed price, and the new output might have a better load profile than the former output. However, there is no guarantee that most existing Altamont facilities will be repowered. Alternatively, new wind facilities could also help meet this estimate, but without the additional benefits of a repowering.

To achieve the 20 percent target by 2010 if there is no CCA or non-core load loss, an additional 175 MW of baseload (e.g., geothermal or biomass) renewable resources would be required beyond that shown in the plan. Proposed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Procurement are summarized on Table 1 below.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company New EE and Renewable Procurement by Year Cumulative Purchases (MW)					
Year	New Energy Efficiency ²⁸	RPS Compliance Renewables	Accelerated Renewables (Wind Repowering)	Total Nameplate Renewables	Reliable MW Renewables
2005	-	-	-	-	-
2006	503	200	100	300	204
2007	708	300	200	500	320
2008	936	550	200	750	596
2009	1168	700	400	1,100	722
2010	1388	900	400	1,300	891
2011	1624	1,150	400	1,550	1,017
2012	1878	1,300	400	1,700	1,045
2013	2156	1,500	400	1,900	1,174
2014		1,750	400	2,150	1,342

²⁸

The energy efficiency targets are those adopted in D.04-09-060, Table 1A. They reflect savings from all energy efficiency – procurement-funded programs, public goods surcharge-funded programs and low-income programs. In its Prepared Testimony, the energy efficiency targets listed in Table 4-10 only included savings funded with 2006 and beyond procurement dollars. Furthermore, the energy savings targets the Commission adopted are “average peak savings” defined as average savings during the summer peak hours. D. 04-09-060, p. 29. In contrast, PG&E proposed coincident and non-coincident peak load reductions in Table 4-10 of its Prepared Testimony.

iii. Conventional Resources

The preferred portfolio includes a mix of conventional resources, including contracts of varying duration and utility owned generation, to meet the balance of its energy requirements. PG&E's primary need is for peaking/shaping resources, which is driven by two key underlying assumptions: (1) the assumed loss of baseload noncore load; and (2) the assumed addition of new baseload renewable resources, some of which operate intermittently.

PG&E proposes to fill these requirements using a variety of short- and medium-term transactions, and long term resources which may be either contracted or utility-owned. PG&E's strategy over the next four years is to contract with existing market resources under short to mid-term contracts. These contracts will ensure adequate supply in the period prior to when new generation facilities may come on-line. The short-term nature of these transactions will help to mitigate, but not eliminate uncertainties from load migration to other suppliers. For example, if participation in community aggregation is greater than anticipated, PG&E can allow a short-term transaction to expire and choose not to replace it or a medium-term transaction will be stranded for a shorter period than a long-term commitment.

The preferred portfolio included only as much long-term capacity as could be used to meet the low load scenario, with the remaining needs filled with short and medium-term contracts. By procuring less long-term resources, PG&E can minimize any stranded costs associated with long-term resource procurement should the low load scenario occur. The preferred plan includes procurement of long-term capacity beginning in 2007-2008, with additional needs in 2010. Given the level of uncertainty in the many assumed variables, anything beyond 2010 has too much conjecture to be actionable and should be re-evaluated in the 2006 plan.

b. Comparison of Medium Load Scenario Portfolio With Alternative Portfolios

In compliance with the June 4 ACR as modified by the June 16 ALJ Ruling, PG&E assumed three plausible cases out of the many possible variations. The medium load scenario is PG&E's best estimate of the needs it expects. As specified in the June 4 ACR, the high and low load scenarios are "reasonable guesses" but not extreme cases of what could happen to future utility load. PG&E designed the preferred portfolio to meet expected requirements under the medium load scenario.

Given the assumptions made on Demand Response, and CCA and noncore load migration there is a risk that procurement anticipated in the preferred portfolio may not be sufficient to meet actual requirements. Should there be less customer departure, higher load growth, or less Demand Response in the early years of the plan (up to 2010), PG&E would seek to contract with existing generation under short-term contracts to balance its requirements. Sustained above-expected loads after 2010 could be met by re-contracting with existing resources with expiring contracts or contracting with new resources. Conversely, if CCA or non-core departures are greater or if energy efficiency is more successful than assumed, short-term contracts would be allowed to expire when their terms are complete.

As stated above, PG&E believes that it is prudent to make long-term commitments based on its low load case with short and medium-term resources used to fill remaining needs. Lower load outcomes are possible, but it would not be prudent to plan for such extremes. Therefore, commitments made in the preferred portfolio should receive cost recovery assurance similar to that received by SCE (D.03-12-059) and SDG&E (D.04-06-011) for their recent commitments, i.e., "...all customers ... that are currently ineligible for direct access are obligated to pay for the stranded costs of any new generation for the next ten years."

IV. Plan Implementation

PG&E proposes to procure additional resources primarily through the use of competitive solicitations during 2004 and as needed in the future. This fall, PG&E will be initiating a series of Requests for Offers (RFO) for new resources to fulfill its long-term resource needs. In keeping with the loading order in the state's EAP, PG&E will aggressively pursue procurement of customer energy efficiency, demand response and renewables, will continue to support and interconnect distributed generation consistent with existing programs and tariffs, and will encourage innovative proposals that meet its resource portfolio needs in a cost-effective manner. PG&E estimates that its plan will result in the avoidance of 29 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions compared to conventional alternatives. PG&E's proposal will help to keep California the nation's leader in reducing carbon emissions.

In order to reduce stranded costs and potential cost shifting, PG&E proposes to move ahead today only with those short-term and mid-term commitments believed to be necessary and cost-effective consistent with the medium load scenario. For the same reason, PG&E proposes to solicit only the long-term commitments that are consistent with the Low Load Scenario. However, the actual amount of noncore and CCA customers and the timing of departure from bundled service are admittedly difficult to forecast at this time and the stranded cost and cost shifting risks cannot be fully mitigated even under this approach. Therefore, PG&E's commitments must be, conditioned upon assurances from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) that the costs of these new commitments will be recoverable under a non-bypassable charge from all customers, including those that elect to take generation services from another supplier, such as a local publicly owned electric utility (as defined in Section 9604(d)), or consistent with community aggregation and noncore options.

a. Renewable Resource Solicitation

On July 15, 2004, PG&E issued its Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) solicitation and PG&E anticipates signing contracts with eligible renewable generators by the end of 2004. PG&E hopes to receive competitive bids for renewable generation that would allow it to surpass the minimum target for incremental renewable energy, 1 percent of retail load, and reach the mandated 20 percent level by 2010 under the Medium Load Scenario in its LTP.

b. Energy Efficiency Solicitation

PG&E will issue multiple RFP for third-party energy efficiency programs. Consistent with the multi-party "Reaching New Heights" proposal filed in the Energy Efficiency OIR 01-08-028, at least 20 percent of the program funds will be implemented by third parties selected through this competitive process.

c. Conventional Resource Solicitations

Short-Term/Mid-Term Commitments: PG&E's strategy over the next four years is to contract with existing market resources under short to mid-term contracts. These contracts will ensure adequate supply in the period prior to when new generation facilities come on-line. The short-term nature of these new transactions will help to mitigate, but not eliminate uncertainties from load migration to other suppliers. For example, if participation in community aggregation is greater than anticipated, PG&E can allow a short-term transaction to expire and chose not to replace it or a medium-term transaction will be stranded for a shorter period than a long-term commitment.

PG&E requests immediate authority from the Commission to execute the short-term and mid-term commitments under its existing short-term procurement plan. (PG&E has filed a petition to modify that would grant five-year contracting authority for these purposes.) PG&E needs flexibility to cost-effectively fill out its mid-term portfolio over time and when conditions are most favorable. The long-term plan proceeding is not an appropriate forum for review and approval of such mid-term transactions. PG&E therefore requests that the Commission either grant its petition for modification of the short-term procurement plan decision and grant PG&E five-year contract authority or otherwise provide such authority in this proceeding.

Long Term Commitments: PG&E will issue two separate RFOs this fall for new peaking, shaping, and dispatchable generation. One RFO will solicit proposals for utility-owned generation and one RFO will solicit resources that would be purchased under long-term contracts. PG&E's target for long-term commitments over the 10-year planning horizon is to achieve 50 percent utility ownership and 50 percent long-term contracts. This will foster the hybrid market model endorsed by the Commission in recent resource decisions by providing new opportunities for the merchant generation sector while ensuring a measure of financial and operational stability through utility ownership. Importantly, the 50/50 approach is also designed to help reduce debt equivalence impacts as compared to a 100 percent power purchase contracts strategy. PG&E intends to focus on its residual needs for the period 2008 to 2010 in this first round of RFOs.

For utility-owned projects, PG&E will request bids from developers. The projects would be subject to cost of service ratemaking. For ratemaking purposes, PG&E will ask the Commission at the time of approval of the RFO results to adopt a reasonable cost for the facility to be placed in rate base and, to the extent that actual costs of construction are less than or equal to such reasonable cost, no after-the-fact reasonableness review would be required. PG&E will also propose recovery mechanisms for ongoing costs.

PG&E anticipates issuing the two RFOs in October and receiving bids near the end of the year. Following the issuance of the LTP decision, PG&E will address any Commission-ordered

changes or modifications to its plan, consult with its Procurement Review Group and will file a compliance filing seeking pre-approval of its proposed winning bidders. In conjunction with such filing, PG&E will assess the cumulative debt equivalence impacts of the proposed winning bids by applying the methodology described in its testimony in this proceeding and also the cost of capital proceeding. In addition PG&E requires that the Commission determine the debt equivalent impact from all signed contract in this solicitation, and that this value be noted for consideration in the appropriate Cost of Capital proceeding. PG&E requests that the Commission review the bids on an expedited basis and issue a decision no later than the second quarter of 2005.

d. Unique Resource Opportunities

PG&E recognizes that certain resource opportunities that may be of substantial benefit to its customers may arise from time to time where timing constraints may require their evaluation by the Commission on a separate, expedited track. For example, in connection with settlement of litigation, certain resources may become available at attractive prices. If these opportunities materialize, PG&E will seek separate approval from the Commission.

V. Plan Approval

PG&E requests that the Commission approve its proposed long-term plan and authorize PG&E to proceed with implementation of the plan as specified herein.

**Summary of Southern California Edison
Company's (U 338-E)
Long-Term Procurement Plan**

SUMMARY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E)
LONG-TERM PROCUREMENT PLAN

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) requests that its 2004 Long-Term Procurement Plan (LTPP) be adopted as the basis for evaluation and approval of future procurement activities. Overall, SCE's plan is to minimize its bundled customers' financial risks by committing only to short- and medium-term, peaking and intermediate resources. Additionally, SCE requests changes to its Existing AB 57 Procurement Plan (Existing AB 57 PP); a new Demand-Side Management proposal; policy findings on demand-side management, debt equivalence and customer base stability.

I.

SUMMARY OF REQUESTED CHANGES TO AB 57 PROCUREMENT PLAN

SCE's LTPP proposes that SCE's Existing AB 57 PP, authorized by the Commission in Decision No. 03-12-062, be modified as set forth below. Acceptance of SCE's revisions will eventually allow SCE to transact on a forward basis up to five years in term for nonrenewable resources to the extent that debt equivalence issues are resolved satisfactorily.¹

Updated Electrical Capacity Limits. SCE proposes that its revised electrical capacity position limit be set annually to equal the difference between a 117% planning reserve level and SCE's current capacity position, including California Department of Water Resources (DWR) contracts allocated to SCE's customers.

¹ Note however that SCE will not initially consider terms in excess of three years for non renewable resources due to debt equivalence limitations.

This modified limit will allow SCE to procure resources needed to meet any resource adequacy requirement (RAR).²

Updated Rate-of-Transaction Limits for Electrical Capacity. Adopt rate of transaction limits that reflect the revised annual electrical capacity limits set forth above, and that reflect SCE's need to secure electrical capacity to meet an RAR.

Updated Limits Contained In SCE's Existing AB 57 PP. SCE will update all limits³ in its Existing AB 57 PP (except those related to electrical capacity procurement) using the methodologies previously utilized in the Existing AB 57 PP.⁴

Other Modification To D.03-12-062 Are Necessary For Clarity And To Eliminate Unnecessary Requirements. SCE's petition for modification (PFM) of D.03-12-062 raised several issues that requires clarification. If that PFM is not acted on before the decision in this proceeding, SCE requests that the outstanding issues raised therein be resolved here. Accordingly, SCE requests:

- Specific timing for approval of the IOUs compliance filings or a statement that the absence of resolution after a defined length of time (90 days) forecloses the opportunity for further review and establishes eligibility for cost recovery;
- A specific statement that the target guideline for spot market purchases does not apply to procurement of capacity to meet WECC operating reserve requirements;

² To the extent the Commission does not adopt a specific load and supply scenario, SCE will use its LTPP medium case load and supply scenario to calculate its updated annual electrical capacity position limits.

³ These include position limits for SCE's forward electrical energy and natural gas sales and purchases, as well as SCE's electric transmission and natural gas pipeline and storage capacity transactions.

⁴ Unless otherwise instructed by the Commission, SCE will use the medium case load and resource scenarios from its LTPP to update its limits.

- Deletion of language that could be interpreted to allow DWR to perform “after-the-fact reasonableness reviews”;
- Changing of language requiring IOUs to consult with their procurement review groups (PRGs) for transactions greater than 90 days, to a requirement that IOUs consult with their PRGs for transactions greater than one calendar quarter (92 days);
- Modification of language directing SCE to assume a “pro rata” allocation of DWR costs. Such language should be replaced with the seven-step process outlined by SCE for treatment of DWR contracts.
- Permission for IOUs to enter into contracts of up to five years in length where delivery begins in 2004 or later and termination occurs prior to 2009;
- Modification of language lowering the “unqualified certification” basis for authorization of SCE’s proprietary risk model;
- Modification of language restricting bilateral transactions to less than one calendar quarter in length and clarify that the term “less than 90 days forward refers to the start date of the transaction”;
- Elimination of requirement that SCE demonstrate that identified over-the-counter (OTC) brokers provide prices equivalent to those of exchanges;
- Clarification of how to measure the level of TeVaR which triggers a PRG meeting;
- Deletion of the sentence stating that a utility should not “arbitrage” in energy markets; and
- Clarification that SCE’s compliance filing is due at the same time as those of Pacific Gas and Electric Company and San Diego Gas and Electric.

Modification to the Application of SCE's Existing AB 57 PP Portfolio Risk

Screen. SCE proposes to revise the application of the Existing AB 57 PP portfolio risk screens. At a minimum SCE proposes that the portfolio risk screen threshold should not be applied to potential transactions that conclude delivery in three years or less, as measured beginning in the first month following the month in which the transaction is executed.

SCE's Existing AB 57 PP Should Be Modified To Become A Rolling Five-Year

Procurement Plan. SCE's Existing AB 57 PP was designed to allow transactions through December 31, 2008. SCE proposes revision of the five year fixed term feature of its Existing AB 57 PP to become a rolling five-year term (i.e., it would be effective on an a forward 60-month evergreen basis, until the plan is superseded by a subsequent procurement plan).

Debt Equivalence Issues Must Be Resolved Before SCE Can Consider

Contracts In Excess of Three Years. SCE proposes to limit its forward transactions for nonrenewable resources to terms of three years or less, until the Commission satisfactorily addresses debt equivalence. SCE will provide written notification to the Commission's Energy Division at such time as SCE believes the debt equivalence issue has been satisfactorily resolved. This notification will indicate that SCE will consider forward contract terms for nonrenewable resources up to five years in duration, but that SCE will not be required to contract up to five years in duration.

Clarification of Authorized Procurement Product. SCE proposes to make two slight changes to the Authorized Procurement Product table (Table IV-1) in the Existing AB 57 PP to clarify the use of products with index based prices. Specifically, the changes will authorize SCE to conduct transactions of Forward Spot Energy (Day-ahead and hour-ahead purchases, sales, or exchanges) at either set prices or at index-based prices.

II.

SUMMARY OF SCE'S DEMAND RESPONSE REQUEST

SCE's LTPP proposes to aggressively increase the amount of Demand-Side Management (DSM) SCE provides with its Advanced Load Control Program (ALC). This proposal will yield 700 MW of peak load reduction by the end of a seven-year deployment beginning in 2005. The average cost of this program will be \$42 million per year.⁵ Under this program, new digital and programmable thermostats with modified dispatch strategies will be deployed to increase customers' comfort options, while providing dispatchable demand reduction program. SCE proposes to target about 500,000 residential customers with this program over a seven year period.

The ALC program would provide for:

- ALC resources to be called upon in less than 10 minutes;
- A "price responsive" program which would be triggered by utility procurement /market prices; SCE plans to trigger the program 50 hours each year on such a basis, and 30 hours for reliability dispatch;
- Load control devices that are addressable so that they can be activated by dispatchers in MW blocks and by geographic district;
- Implementation of a program with no required up-front investment;
- Program cost of below the \$85/kW-yr. threshold established in R.02-06-011;
- A minimum "usage" requirement screen;
- A voice override feature provided at an additional cost.

⁵ SCE proposes to continue other currently authorized Demand Response programs at the levels currently authorized by the Commission.

III.

SUMMARY OF SCE'S REQUESTED STATEMENTS REGARDING CERTAIN COMMISSION POLICIES

SCE's LTPP asks the Commission to make a number of policy statements regarding various issues. SCE sets forth its positions below.

Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency. SCE does not believe that its requested DSM program and its already existing energy efficiency programs can be fully successful without resolution of four policy issues. Accordingly, SCE requests that the Commission (a) extend demand response and energy efficiency planning cycles to coordinate with program funding cycles; (b) refine goals for price-responsive programs set forth in R.02-06-001, to include consideration of all program types (including reliability-based programs, information and customer awareness campaigns, and economics-triggered programs); (c) support utility administration of energy efficiency programs so that IOUs can rely on forecasted demand-side resources at levels envisioned by California's energy agencies; and (d) support performance incentives in furtherance of the Energy Action Plan's conservation and efficiency goals.

Expiring QF Contracts. SCE asks the Commission to defer policy issues surrounding such contracts to the Avoided Cost Proceeding (R.04-04-025).

Debt Equivalence and Collateral Requirements. SCE details the impact of debt equivalence on procurement and asks the Commission to recognize the impact of this issue on long-term contracts, and address that effect in the Cost of Capital proceeding. Similarly, SCE requests that the Commission recognize the impact of two changes to financial accounting standards (EITF Issue No. 01-08 and FIN 46 (R)) that may affect IOUs' costs of contracting for power.

Customer Base Instability. In order to safeguard SCE's bundled service customers, the Commission must temper the ability of customers to switch between

~~B~~undled service and Direct Access service; adopt appropriate exit fees for ~~m~~municipalization and community choice aggregation; and ensure that RARs are ~~e~~qually applied to all LSEs.

IV.

SUMMARY OF GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE PROCUREMENT FOUND IN SCE'S LONG-TERM PROCUREMENT PLAN

In addition to the specific issues outlined above, SCE asks the Commission to adopt SCE's LTPP as the basis for evaluation and approval of future procurement activities that fall under the LTPP. Specifically, SCE seeks approval of its strategy in the following areas.

- Resource Commitments. SCE's current supply portfolio is dominated by long-term and baseload resource commitments. Such a portfolio results in SCE having excess supply that must be sold into the market. SCE seeks to minimize the financial risk of such resources to bundled customers by committing only to short- and medium-term, peaking and intermediate resources.⁶ The multiple scenarios SCE presented in its LTPP all indicated that SCE would follow this strategic path forward, regardless of changes to its load. Accordingly, all of the plan scenarios presented in SCE's LTPP envision filling SCE's needs with short- and medium-term, peaking and intermediate resources.
- Debt Equivalence. Going forward, SCE intends to include debt equivalence costs in its assessments of procurement alternatives of greater than three years on an ongoing basis, both for assessing

⁶ Given the wide array of outcomes related to core/non-core and Community Choice Aggregation, SCE's 2004 LTPP therefore includes no new long-term commitments, other than those necessary to meet RPS requirements.

aggregate procurement plans and for determining which individual resources satisfy SCE's requirements at the lowest cost. SCE's LTPP included the formula SCE intended to use to calculate such costs.

- Financial Accounting Changes. As with debt equivalence, SCE intends to include additional costs ascribed by changes in financial accounting standards described in its testimony when assessing aggregate procurement plans and for determining which individual resources satisfy SCE's requirements at the lowest cost.
- Collateral Requirements. At present, SCE's Existing AB 57 PP includes sufficient collateral capacity for the near term. SCE's ability to stay within such limits will depend heavily upon the length of new contracts signed to meet resource needs. If changing resource requirements lead to higher collateral levels, SCE will request to amend its Existing AB 57 PP to support the additional capacity requirements.
- QF Contracts. SCE has eight QF contracts that are scheduled to terminate prior to December 31, 2005. SCE will offer each of these QFs a five-year SO1 contract commencing on the termination date of their respective contracts, in accordance with D.04-01-050. Additionally, as to two QF contracts, whose termination dates have been extended through December 31, 2004, SCE will offer each of these QFs additional four-year terms under SO1 contract pricing. SCE further reserves the right to comply with PURPA requirements through additional options such as bilateral negotiations and competitive solicitations, in accordance with Decision No. 03-12-062.

**Summary of SDG&E's
Long-Term Resource Plan**

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY OF SDG&E'S LONG-TERM RESOURCE PLAN

The objective of SDG&E's long-term planning process is to provide reliable electric supply to customers at the lowest possible cost and volatility risk, while meeting the State's objectives regarding the preferred loading order for resources. In order to accomplish these goals, SDG&E's long-term plan addresses not only additional demand and supply side resources, but also major transmission lines needed to meet grid reliability criteria, and it also makes recommendations for an integrated balance of each of these resource types. SDG&E's long-term plan provides the three resource scenarios specified in the Assigned Commissioner's June 4, 2004, Ruling and Scoping Memo (ACR), and recommends its medium load plan for Commission approval.

In designing its three resource planning scenarios, SDG&E attempted to accomplish a number of objectives, including meeting the ISO's grid reliability criteria and designing each scenario to meet a planning reserve margin of 15%-17% by 2006. The reserve margin SDG&E used is based on the bundled load SDG&E serves, as directed by the Commission in D.04-01-050. Due to the fixed size of individual resources and other policy objectives, reserve margins in SDG&E's plan will fluctuate around a target as resources are added, and may slightly exceed the targeted reserve in some years. This circumstance is more problematic for SDG&E than the other electric IOUs due to SDG&E's relatively smaller size. As an example, adding a typical size 50 MW combustion turbine to SDG&E's system would impact reserves by over 1%, as compared to SCE and PG&E where the same size unit would impact reserves by about a quarter of a percent.

Resources were added in SDG&E's plan according to the Commission's preferred loading order. First, SDG&E reduced the forecasted load by expected levels of cost-effective energy efficiency and distributed generation. Second, demand reduction programs were added to further reduce the resource need. Third, renewable power was added to meet an accelerated Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) target of 20% of energy needs by 2010. Finally, conventional resources were added to meet the remaining need. SDG&E tailored resource additions so that in combination with the existing resources, the resource mix includes a combination of base loaded, intermediate and peaking resources to meet the overall load shape of SDG&E's customers.

The results presented in its long-term plan provide the basis for SDG&E's request that the Commission endorse a long-term sequence of resource types, sizes, and timing that will guide SDG&E's activities to bring specific, conforming resource proposals to the Commission for approval in coming years. While changing circumstances and/or more detailed analysis accompanying specific resource additions will be reflected as necessary in the future, it is expected that Commission approval of SDG&E's medium load plan in this proceeding will serve as the essential first step in SDG&E's further development of specific resource proposals in coming years. In the event that larger scale changes are needed to the overall plan due to significant changes in key drivers (such as availability and cost of resources), these modifications will be included in future updates to the long-term plan and subsequent implementation processes.

SDG&E's resource plan also calls for additional local transmission and a new 500 kV line in 2010 under the medium load plan, pursuant to SDG&E's balanced portfolio strategy and to ensure grid reliability. Once this needed transmission is in place in 2010,

the remaining four years of the plan lay out a strategy to replace the expiring DWR contracts and meet continuing load growth after cost-effective energy efficiency and demand response programs have been implemented. These resource needs will be met by continuing to pursue renewable power beyond the 20% target, adding on-system generation to provide needed energy and capacity as well as to address local area reliability, and adding an additional increment of generation that may be on- or off-system depending on price and availability at the time.

SDG&E's three (medium, high, and low) resource plan scenarios illustrate how the plan will react given the load uncertainty SDG&E faces with the possible implementation of a core/noncore structure and Community Choice Aggregation (CCA). The base case, or medium load plan scenario, is SDG&E's preferred plan, which represents SDG&E's best estimate of the resources needed to reliably serve its customers. Similar to last year's filing, this resource plan follows the Commission's adopted loading order and also relies on a mix of new transmission and in-service area resources as the best integrated balance for SDG&E's service area. It shows no loss of load to a core/noncore split or CCA. SDG&E used this load scenario so that the Commission will have a resource plan illustrating what is needed during the ten-year planning horizon based on what is known today about future load departure. Given the uncertainty surrounding the timing and magnitude of emerging rules for CCA and direct access and the potential resulting outcomes, this is the plan SDG&E believes it is most likely going to have to serve.

In this plan, reserve margins assume a ramp-up in 2005, but then target a minimum of 15% for 2006 – 2014. Efforts to achieve 20% of the energy mix by 2010

from renewable power will mean SDG&E will primarily procure only renewable power until 2010. SDG&E will assess the timing and costs of renewable power in the renewables RFP that was issued on July 1, 2004. The medium load plan also assumes that new transmission capability is added in 2010 to address grid reliability and load pocket issues. This additional transmission also helps reduce the need for RMR units and is anticipated to provide access to additional renewable sources that SDG&E shows coming into its plan in 2011-2014.

Beginning in 2011, SDG&E will add a combination of resource types to replace the expiring DWR contracts and potentially to replace retirement of aging local generation currently providing RMR, if necessary. The majority of the resource additions are predicted to be from on-system resources to maintain grid reliability and further reduce RMR costs. The resources considered include distributed generation, existing generation facilities, repowered facilities or new facilities. Through the combination of transmission additions and local generation committed to SDG&E, the medium load plan ultimately eliminates the need for additional resources to be procured for RMR.

SDG&E's high load scenario shows how SDG&E would adjust its plan to serve a higher bundled load occurring along with some additional departing load to direct access. The higher load is the result of stronger economic growth, but it is somewhat mitigated by the additional customers being served by other providers. Under this case, additional renewable resources are needed to meet the 20% goal. In order to meet grid reliability, this case adds the same transmission as was added in the base case plus additional on-system resources. This plan is similar to the medium load plan with additional resources needed to meet a higher load. In the 2006 – 2010 timeframe, additional renewable power

is procured to meet the increased load and to meet the 20% goal. Also, additional on-system resources are procured in 2007-2010 to reduce RMR costs. In the 2011 – 2014 timeframe, the higher load is served with additional renewable power to achieve the same percentage as in the base case, and with additional peaking to intermediate resources, the majority of which are on-system to meet grid reliability and reduce RMR costs. In this case, the plan was able to respond to higher loads with little price change. The higher fixed costs are partially attributed to higher RMR capacity costs. The higher peak requires more RMR units be retained to meet local grid reliability needs. The high load scenario shows that SDG&E's plan can address a higher than expected load through the addition of relatively small amounts of generation beyond that added in the medium load plan. The high case also further illustrates the value of having the additional transmission proposed for 2010, since this additional capacity helps address grid reliability concerns should local generation be slowed in its development.

The low load scenario shows what can happen should there be aggressive departures due to core/noncore and CCA, with subsequent significant migration of load to these options in a relatively short period of time. In this scenario, SDG&E has also assumed that it would still be required to meet 20% of its energy needs from renewable power in 2010, even though it did not need the associated capacity to meet reserves. This case also includes the additional transmission as in the other cases to meet grid reliability. SDG&E will add fewer resources in this case due to smaller bundled load than in the base case. Under this scenario, SDG&E would not need any resource additions through 2010. However, for this scenario SDG&E has assumed that it would still be required to meet the 20% renewable energy target by 2010. Non-renewable resources would not be

needed until 2011 as CDWR contracts expire. SDG&E would then add in-basin resources to meet the resource requirement and reduce RMR costs.

Although total load is lower in this scenario due to slower economic growth, total load in the region continues to grow. Because SDG&E has no need for additional resources to generate power to serve its customers, and assuming a CCA does not build local generation thereby contributing to grid reliability, additional transmission is still needed to maintain grid reliability. This case also results in the greatest need for RMR units. This result occurs because even though the overall load is lower than other cases (which reduces the total grid reliability need), SDG&E's small incremental resource needs limit the ability to reduce RMR through adding local generation, as would occur in the medium load base case and high load cases.

The high costs in SDG&E's low load scenario show how uncoordinated implementation of core/noncore and CCA can create costs. The case also shows that although additional economic sales may be made with the excess power, they are not likely to fully offset the cost of the surplus capacity. Some of these higher costs would be allocated across all customers for grid reliability and some costs would need to be allocated to CCA customers to prevent any cost shifting.

SDG&E's three resource scenarios were modeled utilizing Henwood Energy's RiskSym model in order to determine production costs. Each scenario was modeled under load, fuel and market price uncertainty, which was allowed to vary based on historical volatility. This allowed for comparisons both in terms of expected value and also showing the potential range of outcomes given load and pricing uncertainty. Each

scenario was then evaluated by assessing a number of value measures, including total costs to customers, and implications caused by the load uncertainty.

The medium load plan shows that SDG&E is well positioned to meet its service territory's needs over the ten-year planning horizon and beyond. This preferred plan is able to focus almost entirely on renewable additions through 2010 because the conventional resources needed to ensure grid reliability in the period have been secured through the recently-approved SDG&E grid reliability RFP.

SDG&E's transmission analysis is also based on high, medium and low load forecasts. It assumes all the existing local and planned generation described above remain in service throughout the planning horizon, with the exception of the South Bay Power Plant, which SDG&E assumes will retire in the end of 2009 when the lease expires. Assuming the retirement of the South Bay Power Plant provides a conservative planning assumption, ensuring that SDG&E's plans can meet the region's needs given this uncertainty. The retirement of any other of the existing generation would cause the grid reliability need to increase by an amount equal to the additional capacity retired.

The medium load scenario demonstrates that SDG&E's grid reliability deficiency is 215 MW in 2010. SDG&E believes that the addition of a 500 kV interconnection is the best alternative to meet this grid reliability deficiency, providing at least 500 MW of increased non-simultaneous import limit (NSIL). Under the high load scenario, a 659 MW deficiency in 2010 exists, with the potential need for another major transmission upgrade as early as 2011 assuming no new generation is added during the 2010 to 2014 window. The low load scenario shows the first grid reliability deficiency in 2012. In this scenario, although not needed for grid reliability between 2010 and 2012, the line could

still provide value since it would increase system wide reliability, provide for better energy access, and reduce the need for RMR units in the San Diego area.

A new 500 kV transmission line would provide a variety of benefits. Among them would be greater reliability, improved access to potentially lower cost, fuel diverse resources, allowing SDG&E to meet its 2010 renewables target, improved statewide grid reliability, reduction in RMR need, and reduced congestion costs.

The electric grid in California must be planned to accommodate a reasonable range of scenarios, and all of SDG&E's possible future load scenarios support the need for a new 500 kV transmission line beginning as early as 2010. Even in the low load scenario, a grid reliability deficiency is identified starting in 2012. Given that a new 500 kV line would provide additional statewide reliability for better energy access, reduce the need for RMR units in the San Diego area, and provide a reliability safety net for the uncertain timing of the transmission siting regulatory process, SDG&E believes that even this low load scenario requires SDG&E to continue the work needed to plan and receive Commission approval for a major 500 kV transmission expansion.

Currently, SDG&E has two conceptual configurations for an additional 500 kV transmission line that would provide benefits:

1. A 500 kV transmission line interconnecting SDG&E's Imperial Valley substation with a substation interconnected to the existing SDG&E 230 kV transmission grid. This alternative will generally follow an East-West direction and would involve termination at the western end with a 500/230 kV transformation to accommodate the injection of power flow into SDG&E's transmission system. It is expected that this configuration will provide substantial increases in both SIL and NSIL import levels. It is estimated that this alternative will be approximately 85 to 150 miles long with a conceptual cost^{317/} of \$650 million.

^{317/}

These cost estimates are highly conceptual and do not include O&M costs. When SDG&E determines a final plan of service for the proposed 500 kV transmission expansion detailed cost estimates will be developed.

2. A 500 kV transmission line interconnecting SCE's 500 kV system with a substation interconnected to the existing SDG&E 230 kV transmission grid as proposed by the Lake Elsinore Municipal Water District for its Lake Elsinore Pumped Storage Project (LEAPS). This alternative will generally follow a North-South direction and would include termination at the southern end with a 500/230 kV transformation to accommodate the expected current injection of flows into SDG&E's transmission system. It is expected that this configuration will provide substantial increases in both SIL and NSIL import levels. This alternative is estimated to be approximately 35 to 50 miles long with a conceptual cost of \$450 million.

An increase in SDG&E's NSIL of 500 MW, from 2500 to 3000 MW, and an increase in SIL level of 750 MW, from 2850 MW to 3600 MW, could conservatively be achieved with the addition of either of these lines. A combination of both of these transmission projects would provide additional increased import capability to San Diego, meet the CAISO's long-term goal to further develop the backbone 500 kV transmission system, and provide increased transfer capabilities allowing on-system resources to off-system market customers and may prove to be the best long-term alternative for ratepayers.

ATTACHMENT B

President Peevey's ACR Dated September 16, 2004

ATTACHMENT B

CPUC, CEC, and CAISO are collaborating to support integrated planning and procurement in California.

- CEC's 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report ("IEPR") process will estimate need for resource additions, evaluate policies and recommend appropriate resource strategies for the state to meet forecasted load on a biennial cycle.
- All load serving entities will provide load forecasts, resource plans and transmission assessment as input into the IEPR process.
- The CAISO will provide the key policy issues and components of its transmission assessment processes.
- The IEPR will (1) identify likely range of statewide and LSE-specific need and resource assessment to be used by the CPUC when evaluating in IOU's long-term procurement plans for submittal in 2006 CPUC procurement process, (2) provide disaggregated load forecasts to CAISO for use by PTOs and CAISO in the next transmission assessment cycle, and (3) recommend broad, statewide resource preference policies.
- CPUC's procurement process will produce IOU-specific procurement plans, require competitive generation solicitations, incorporate needed transmission upgrades and guide preferred resource acquisition to ensure resource adequacy on a biennial cycle beginning in 2006.
- CEC provides ranges of likely need and resource assessment for individual IOUs and statewide policy preferences from IEPR.

- Transmission projects contained in the approved plans will be evaluated in annual CAISO transmission planning process. If the CAISO's transmission economic assessment methodology is accepted by the CPUC, then the CPUC will use the CAISO's determination of need for projects.
- IOUs fulfill/implement approved long-term plans through competitive procurement processes, filing for permits, or other approved processes.
- CAISO's Annual Grid Planning Process receives information from both the CPUC's procurement process and the CEC's IEPR and integrates this information into a comprehensive view for the CAISO-controlled grid, and develops a project-specific set of preferred transmission projects.
- Receives Participating Transmission Owner (PTO) (includes IOUs and some munis) transmission plans.
- Receives additional IOU transmission project information from CPUC procurement process.
- Receives CEC's disaggregated load forecasts from IEPR.
- Provides CAISO policy perspective on transmission issues as input into CEC's IEPR and CPUC's procurement proceeding for review.
- Produces approved preferred transmission alternatives for IOUs that then go through the CPUC permitting process.

(END OF ATTACHMENT B)

**ATTACHMENT C
LIST OF APPEARANCES**

***** APPEARANCES *****

Marc D. Joseph
Attorney At Law
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
651 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, SUITE 900
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080
(650) 589-1660
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
For: CUE

Karen Terranova
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, STE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
filings@a-klaw.com
For: Sargent Canyon Cogeneration

Michael Alcantar
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
1300 SW FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 1750
PORTLAND OR 97201
(503) 226-8400
mpa@a-klaw.com
For: Cogeneration Association of California

Nora Sheriff
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
nes@a-klaw.com
For: Coalinga Cogeneration Company

Rod Aoki
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
rsa@a-klaw.com
For: Energy Producers and Users Coalition

John R. Redding
ARCTURUS ENERGY CONSULTING
31 EUCALYPTUS LANE
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901
(415) 455-9085
johnrredding@earthlink.net
For: Silicon Valley Manufacturers Group

Barbara R. Barkovich
BARKOVICH AND YAP, INC.
44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE
MENDOCINO CA 95460
(707) 937-6203
brbarkovich@earthlink.net
For: Barkovich and Yap, Inc.

Reed V. Schmidt
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE
BERKELEY CA 94703
(510) 653-3399 X 111
rschmidt@bartlewells.com
For: California City County Street Light Association

Grant Rosenblum
PHIL PETTINGILL
Attorney At Law
CAL INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR
110 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM CA 95630
(916) 608-7138
grosenblum@caiso.com

Chris King
CALIFORNIA CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT
ONE TWIN DOLPHIN DRIVE
REDWOOD CITY CA 94065
(650) 631-7230
chris@emeter.com

Ronald Liebert
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE
SACRAMENTO CA 95833
(916) 561-5657
rliebert@cfbf.com
For: California Farm Bureau Federation

Grant A. Rosenblum
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM CA 95630
(916) 608-7138
grosenblum@caiso.com
For: CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM

Linda Y. Sherif
Attorney At Law
CALPINE CORP.
4160 DUBLIN BOULEVARD
DUBLIN CA 94568
(925) 479-6600
lsheif@calpine.com
For: Calpine Corporation

**ATTACHMENT C
LIST OF APPEARANCES**

Avis Clark
CALPINE CORPORATION
4160 DUBLIN BLVD.
DUBLIN CA 94568
(925) 479-6640
aclark@calpine.com
For: Calpine Corporation

Marjorie Oxsen
CALPINE CORPORATION
4160 DUBLIN BOULEVARD
DUBLIN CA 94568
(925) 479-6702
moxsen@calpine.com
For: Calpine Corporation

Steven S. Schleimer
CALPINE CORPORATION
4160 DUBLIN BLVD.
DUBLIN CA 94568
(925) 479-6808
sschleimer@calpine.com
For: Calpine Corporation

Kevin Duggan
CAPSTONE TURBINE CORPORATION
21211 NORDHOFF STREET
CHATSWORTH CA 91311
(818) 407-3642
kduggan@capstoneturbine.com
For: CAPSTONE TURBINE CORPORATION

Joseph Peter Como
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM. 234
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 554-4637
joe.como@sfgov.org
For: City & County of San Francisco

Elizabeth Hull
Deputy City Attorney
CITY OF CHULA VISTA
276 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91910
(619) 691-5037
ehull@ci.chula-vista.ca.us
For: City of Chula Vista

Frederick M. Ortlieb
Office Of City Attorney
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
1200 THIRD AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 236-6318
fortlieb@sandiego.gov
For: City of San Diego

W. Kent Palmerton
Vice President
CONSTELLATION POWER SOURCE
1215 K STREET, SUITE 1700
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
kent.palmerton@constellation.com

Howard Choy
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1100 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES CA 90063
(323) 881-3939
hchoy@isd.co.la.ca.us
For: County of Los Angeles

R. Thomas Beach
CROSSBORDER ENERGY
2560 NINTH STREET, SUITE 316
BERKELEY CA 94710
(510) 649-9790
tomb@crossborderenergy.com
For: CROSSBORDER ENERGY

David Kates
DAVID MARK AND COMPANY
3510 UNOCAL PLACE, SUITE 200
SANTA ROSA CA 95403-5571
(707) 570-1866
dkates@sonic.net
For: Nevada Hydro Company

Jeffrey Gray
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 6TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834
(415) 276-6581
jeffgray@dwt.com
For: Calpine Corporation

**ATTACHMENT C
LIST OF APPEARANCES**

Edward W. O'Neill
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834
(415) 276-6582
edwardoneill@dwt.com

Steven F. Greenwald
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 6TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 276-6500
stevegreenwald@dwt.com
For: Calpine Corporation

Christopher Hilen
Attorney At Law
DAVIS, WRIGHT TERMAINE, LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 276-6573
chrishilen@dwt.com
For: Calpine Corporation

Daniel W. Douglass
Attorney At Law
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367-8102
(818) 593-3939
douglass@energyattorney.com
For: WESTERN POWER TRADING FORUM

Gregory S.G. Klatt
Attorney At Law
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
411 E. HUNTINGTON DRIVE, SUITE 107-356
ARCADIA CA 91007
(626) 294-9421
klatt@energyattorney.com
For: ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY MARKETS/STRATEGIC
ENERGY LLC & CONSTELLATION NEW ENERGY, INC.

Ramona Gonzalez
EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
375 ELEVENTH STREET, M/S NO. 205
OAKLAND CA 94607
(510) 287-1619
ramonag@ebmud.com
For: East Bay Municipal Utility District

Greggory L. Wheatland
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
glw@eslawfirm.com
For: Duke Energy North America

Douglas K. Kerner
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
dkk@eslawfirm.com
For: Independent Energy Producers Association (IEP)

Andrew B. Brown
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
abb@eslawfirm.com
For: CONSTELLATION POWER SOURCE

Lynn Haug
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-3109
(916) 447-2166
lmh@eslawfirm.com
For: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

Garson Knapp
FPL ENERGY, LLC
770 UNIVERSE BLVD.
JUNO BEACH FL 33408
(561) 304-5720
garson_knapp@fpl.com

James D. Squeri
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
jsqueri@gmssr.com
For: Powerex Corp.

**ATTACHMENT C
LIST OF APPEARANCES**

Brian Cragg
Attorney At Law
GOODIN, MAC BRIDE, SQUERI, RITCHIE & DAY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
bcragg@gmssr.com
For: West Coast Power

Dian M. Grueneich
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
dgrueneich@gralegal.com

Jack Mc Gowan
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
docket-control@gralegal.com

Jody S. London
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
jlondon@gralegal.com

Joe Desmond
President
INFOTILITY, INC.
4847 HOPYARD RD. STE. 4311
PLEASANTON CA 94588
(925) 275-3185 207
joe@infotility.com

Jennifer Holmes
ITRON INC.
153 WOODCREST PLACE
SANTA CRUZ CA 95065
jennifer.holmes@itron.com

Keith E. Fuller
Director Of Consulting Services
ITRON, INC.
11236 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DEIGO CA 92130-2650
(858) 481-0081
keith.fuller@itron.com

William H. Booth
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH
1500 NEWELL AVENUE, 5TH FLOOR
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596
(925) 296-2460
wbooth@booth-law.com
For: California Large Energy Consumers Association

John W. Leslie
Attorney At Law
LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS, LLP
11988 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 200
SAN DIEGO CA 92130
(858) 720-6352
jleslie@luce.com
For: Coral Power, LLC

Randall W. Keen
Attorney At Law
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
(310) 312-4361
pucservice@manatt.com
For: County of Los Angeles

Margaret R. Snow
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS
11355 W. OLYMPIC BLVD.
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
(310) 312-4247
msnow@manatt.com
For: City of Chula Vista

David L. Huard
Attorney At Law
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
(310) 312-4247
dhuard@manatt.com
For: City of Chula Vista

Roger A. Berliner
Attorney At Law
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
1501 M STREET, N.W., SUITE 700
WASHINGTON DC 20005-1702
(202) 463-4300
rberliner@manatt.com
For: MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP

**ATTACHMENT C
LIST OF APPEARANCES**

Matthew V. Brady
Attorney At Law
MATTHEW V. BRADY & ASSOCIATES
2339 GOLD MEADOW WAY
GOLD RIVER CA 95670
(916) 442-5600
matt@bradylawus.com
For: California Department of General Services (Gas Matters)

C. Susie Berlin
Attorney At Law
MC CARTHY & BERLIN, LLP
2005 HAMILTON AVENUE, SUITE 140
SAN JOSE CA 95125
(408) 558-0950
sberlin@mccarthylaw.com
For: Northern California Power Agency

Barry F. Mccarthy
Attorney At Law
MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP
2005 HAMILTON AVENUE, SUITE 140
SAN JOSE CA 95125
(408) 558-0950
bmcc@mccarthylaw.com
For: CA Manufacturers & Technology, Assn

Christopher J. Mayer
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 4060
MODESTO CA 95352-4060
(209) 526-7430
chrism@mid.org
For: Modesto Irrigation District

Scott T. Steffen
Attorney At Law
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 4060
MODESTO CA 95352
(209) 526-7387
scottst@mid.org
For: Modesto Irrigation District

Sara Steck Myers
Attorney At Law
122 - 28TH AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121
(415) 387-1904
ssmyers@att.net
For: Center for Energy Efficiency & Renewable Technologies
(CEERT)

Sheryl Carter
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20/F
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 875-6100
scarter@nrdc.org
For: Natural Resources Defense Council

Noel Obiora
Legal Division
RM. 4107
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-5987
nao@cpuc.ca.gov
For: ORA

John W. Bogy
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-8302
j0b5@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas & Electric

Edward V. Kurz
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-6669
evk1@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Jennifer K. Post
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, ROOM 2496
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-9809
jilkm@pge.com
For: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Mary A. Gandesbery
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-0675
magq@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas & Electric

**ATTACHMENT C
LIST OF APPEARANCES**

James Ross
RCS CONSULTING, INC.
500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320
CHESTERFIELD MO 63017
(636) 530-9544
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
For: Midway Sunset Cogeneration Company

Donald W. Schoenbeck
RCS, INC.
900 WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 780
VANCOUVER WA 98660
(360) 737-3877
dws@r-c-s-inc.com
For: Kern River Cogeneration Company

Jeanne B. Armstrong
RITCHIE & DAY, LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
jarmstrong@gmsr.com
For: SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Joseph R. Kloberdanz
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1530
(858) 654-1771
jkloberdanz@semprautilities.com

James Ozenne
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
555 W. FIFTH ST., STE. 1400
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1034
(213) 244-3821
jozenne@semprautilities.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Jeffrey M. Parrott
Attorney At Law
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
101 ASH STREET, HQ 13D
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 699-5063
jparrott@sempra.com

Lisa Urick
Attorney At Law
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
555 W. 5TH STREET, SUITE 1400
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1011
(213) 244-2955
lurick@sempra.com

Theodore Roberts
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET, HQ 13D
SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017
(619) 699-5111
troberts@sempra.com
For: Semptra Energy Global Enterprises

Osa Armi
Attorney At Law
SHUTE MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP
396 HAYES STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 552-7272
armi@smwlaw.com
For: Save Southwest Riverside County

John Redding
SILICON VALLEY MANUFACTURING GROUP
31 EUCALYPTUS LANE
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901
(415) 455-9085
johnredding@earthlink.net

Justin D. Bradley
SILICON VALLEY MANUFACTURING GROUP
224 AIRPORT PARKWAY, SUITE 620
SAN JOSE CA 95110
(408) 501-7864
jbradley@svmg.org

Annette Gilliam
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-4880
annette.gilliam@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison Co.

Beth A. Fox
FRANK J. COOLEY; LAURA I. GENAO; S.ERIC
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-6897
beth.fox@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison

Diana Mahmud
STATE WATER CONTRACTORS
455 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 20
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-4409
(213) 217-6985
dmahmud@mwdh2o.com
For: STATE WATER CONTRACTORS

**ATTACHMENT C
LIST OF APPEARANCES**

Eric C. Woychik
STRATEGY INTEGRATION LLC
9901 CALODEN LANE
OAKLAND CA 94605
(510) 635-2359
eric@strategyi.com
For: Utility Consumers' Action Network

Keith Mccrea
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2415
(202) 383-0705
keith.mccrea@sablaw.com
For: CA Manufacturers & Technology Assn.

Michel Peter Florio
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
mflorio@turn.org
For: TURN

Michael Shames
Attorney At Law
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK
3100 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE B
SAN DIEGO CA 92103
(619) 696-6966
mshames@ucan.org

Joseph M. Karp
Attorney At Law
WHITE & CASE LLP
3 EMBARCADERO CENTER, 22ND FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 544-1103
jkarp@whitecase.com
For: California Wind Energy Association

Lisa A. Cottle
JOSEPH KARP
Attorney At Law
WHITE & CASE LLP
3 EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 2210
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4050
(415) 544-1100
lcottle@whitecase.com
For: California Cogeneration Council

Amy C Yip-Kikugawa
Legal Division
RM. 5135
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2004
ayk@cpuc.ca.gov

Carol A Brown
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5103
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2971
cab@cpuc.ca.gov

(END OF ATTACHMENT C)